

Domestic Slavery in the South.

SPEECH

OF

HON. LUCIUS J. GARTRELL, OF GEORGIA.

Delivered in the House of Representatives, January 25, 1858.

Mr. GARTRELL. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago I desired to obtain the floor for the purpose of presenting some views on the grave and important questions growing out of the illegal arrest of General William Walker and his men, on the soil of Nicaragua. But the debate on that question having been temporarily suspended, and the matter having passed to the appropriate committee for investigation and report, I proceed to the consideration of a subject of graver importance to my immediate constituents, and fraught with more serious considerations to the nation at large. I allude to the subject of domestic Slavery at the South, and the necessity for its expansion and its perpetuation in this country.

I am prompted thus early to this course by the extraordinary speech pronounced on this floor a few days ago by the gentleman from Missouri, [Mr. BLAIR.] The ostensible and avowed object of that speech was the necessity and propriety of acquiring territory in Central America, wherein to colonize the free people of color now residing in the United States, and such as may hereafter become free; and there to maintain them in the enjoyment of their freedom as a dependency of this Government.

In announcing this novel and impracticable policy, the gentleman took occasion, very gratuitously, to denounce the institution of Slavery as "a cancer on the face, which, unless removed, would eat into the vitals of the body politic."

This fanatical idea, stereotyped and repeated by a certain class of politicians in this country, from the time of John Randolph to this hour, was as false at its inception as it is erroneous in its conclusion. I deny it emphatically; and I am here to-day, in the presence of this Congress, to maintain the reverse of the proposition. I hold that the institution of domestic Slavery in the South is right, both in principle and practice; that it has ever been, and still is, a blessing to the African race; that it has developed the resources of this great country to an

untold extent; and that, by its conservative influences, it has elevated us in the scale of morality, wealth, enterprise, and intelligence, to a point never attained by any other people.

As a Southern man, proud of the place of my nativity; as the owner of slaves; as conscientious of my moral obligations, I trust, as any gentleman on this floor, I hesitate not, here or elsewhere, to defend this institution, as being strictly in accordance with the principles of right, of Christian duties, and of morality, and as having the highest sanction of laws, both human and divine. I rejoice that the public mind at the South is being awakened to this view of the question. The time for apologies by the South is past. I am here to-day (and the Southern people who have this institution in their midst are to-day prepared to do the same) to stand up before the nations of the world, and defiantly defend and justify domestic Slavery, in its greatest length, extent, and breadth.

Sir, the false prophecies of Randolph and others, alluded to by the gentleman, of the evil consequences of this institution on the moral and political interests of the Southern people, are fast being obliterated by those unerring teachers, time and experience. Other nations, too, are beginning to see and to acknowledge the error of their misguided philanthropy, and to bow in acknowledgment of not only the justice, but the wisdom of domestic Slavery in this country. France and England are beginning to see the error of their misguided philanthropy, and you find them to-day ready to embark in a system of Slavery more barbarous and oppressive than this world has ever seen.

But, Mr. Chairman, I beg the indulgence of the Committee while I very briefly discuss the moral aspect of this institution. I intend to do so calmly, dispassionately, deliberately. I intend to make no charges, against those who array all their influence and power against this institution, that are not sustained by facts and

by records. I am here to-day as a Southern man; and I proclaim now, that this institution is not only sanctioned by the Constitution of your country, under which we all appear here to-day, but is sanctioned by records of the highest character. That that institution has existed from the earliest periods of history, no man of ordinary intelligence will deny. We learn from the Holy Scriptures that Abraham, and many other wise and good men of that day, not only held slaves, but exercised acts of complete ownership over them; and that God himself, after he had rescued the children of Israel from the house of bondage, sanctioned and recognised Slavery, both in principle and in practice. In defining the rules for their government and their moral observance, it was prescribed that—

“Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's man servant, nor his maid servant, nor anything that is thy neighbor's.”

Thus, sir, not only sanctioning Slavery, but providing for its protection for all time to come. I beg leave most respectfully to commend this commandment to the attention of the gentlemen who sit on the other side of this Hall; and, sir, I trust they will cease to covet our men servants, and our maid servants too; and if they do covet them, that at least they will not attempt to deprive us of them by means in violation of the Constitution of our common country.

Besides, this institution is not only recognised by divine authority, but it is perpetuated. I ask the attention of the House to that portion of Holy Writ. I read, sir, from the Bible—from the Book of books. I commend it to the perusal of gentlemen. I have no doubt they are in the habit of reading it; but, upon this question, they seem rather hard of belief. I find in the 25th chapter of Leviticus a passage which reads as follows:

“44. Both thy bondmen and thy bondmaids, which thou shalt have, shall be of the heathen that are round about you; of them shall ye buy bondmen and bondmaids.

“45. Moreover, of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of them shall ye buy, and of their families that are with you, which they begat in your land; and they shall be your possession.

“46. And ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession; they shall be your bondmen forever.”

African slaves having been taken from among the heathen by our ancestors in England, and by our forefathers in the North, we, as their descendants, claim them as an inheritance to us and to our children, “to inherit them as a possession,” and they shall be our bondmen and bondwomen forever.

Sir, time will not allow me to trace or pursue this branch of the subject further. I desire to read a short extract, which so fully and so

truthfully expresses my own sentiments upon this branch of the subject, that I desire to call the attention of the House to it. It is from a speech delivered a few years ago by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia upon my right, [Mr. SMITH.] I desire to read this extract, and have it incorporated into my speech. That distinguished gentleman, upon that occasion, remarked as follows:

“I believe that the institution of Slavery is a noble one; that it is necessary for the good, the well-being of the negro race. Looking to history, I go further, and I say, in the presence of this assembly, and under all the imposing circumstances surrounding me, that I believe it is God's institution. Yes, sir, if there is anything in the action of the great Author of us all; if there is anything in the conduct of His chosen people; if there is anything in the conduct of Christ himself, who came upon this earth, and yielded up his life as a sacrifice, that all through His death might live; if there is anything in the conduct of His Apostles, who inculcated obedience on the part of slaves towards their masters as a Christian duty—then we must believe that the institution is from God.” — *Hon. William Smith, of Virginia, in a speech in the House of Representatives.*

Every sentiment expressed in that eloquent extract meets my hearty approbation. As a Christian man, believing in the teachings of Holy Writ, I am here to-day before a Christian nation to reaffirm and reannounce the conclusion to which that distinguished gentleman came—that this institution, however much it may have been reviled, is of God.

I desire now to notice another error into which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAIR] has fallen. He told you and the country that, “unhappily for the slave States, many of their enterprising young men leave their native land for those States where individual ability and exertion are sufficient to confer wealth and eminence.”

Mr. Chairman, this is a fancy sketch—the offspring of a heated imagination. Why, sir, let me give you the facts as they exist; and I may say to that gentleman, that he knows but little of the enterprise, the industry, and the resources, of the Southern country, and but little of the enterprise of our young men, if he supposes for a moment that they are compelled “to fly to other lands” to obtain wealth and eminence. Sir, the opposite is true. It is admitted that the Northern States annually send out hundreds of their young men to the Southern States, in search of that employment which is denied them at home; and there to receive a living and support, and acquire wealth and eminence, too, in the midst of what gentlemen on the other side of the House call the monopolizing influence of the slave power.

Proceedings upon this floor afford evidence of what I say. A few days ago, the facetious

gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. THAYER] declared that we must and would Americanize Central America; that it was necessary to supply the means of subsistence for the superabundant population of the North. The gentleman told us, in a manner that really excited my sympathies, that the Yankees (I believe he termed them) were in a tight place, and must have the lands of Central America to emigrate to. Well, sir, I am willing that our Yankee friends shall go there. I presume they will go there; but I hope they will have a little better success than they had a few years ago, in their efforts to redeem the barren pine fields and sedge patches of Virginia. I say I think it is very likely that our Yankee friends will go there, and, when there, follow the example of those who have heretofore gone South—become the owners of slaves, aid in developing the resources of the country, and show the world that the institution of domestic Slavery is a blessing, not only to the master, but to the slave.

But, let me say to the gentleman from Missouri, in all kindness, that if he expects to plant a colony of blacks upon our Southern borders, he has very much mistaken the spirit of the age. It is a monstrous proposition, to which the South would never submit. Your efforts at colonizing the African race must always, as heretofore, prove abortive, because based upon a wrong principle; you can no more enslave the Anglo-Saxon race on this continent, than you can make freemen of the Africans. You would not dare to attempt the one, nor can you effect the other. Slavery has been written on the brow of the African. The Ethiopian cannot change his skin, nor the leopard his spots; neither can the wisdom of Solon or Lycurgus invent a system of laws by which to elevate the African to political equality and the enjoyment of political sovereignty. Sir, my experience teaches me, confirmed by daily observations, that they are incapable of self-government, and must ever be. You cannot make freemen out of them. They are idle, dissolute, improvident, lazy, unthrifty, who think not of to-morrow, who provide but scantily for to-day. These seem to be the inherent laws of their nature. You cannot change this law of nature.

Several years ago, Mr. Chairman, a half a century, perhaps, the French and English Governments, pursuing what has turned out to be a misguided philanthropy, attempted to colonize the negro, and give him political power and sovereignty. What has been the result? The experiment resulted in a failure, and has been productive of evil instead of benefit to the black race. In 1794, the National Assembly of France enacted a law emancipating Hayti. In order to show the effects and consequences of that ill-advised legislation on that garden spot of the world, the rich is and of Hayti, I desire to direct the attention of the Committee to a few statistics. I find, sir, I will repeat, that Hayti was emancipated by the act of the National Assem-

bly of France, in 1794. In 1789, the products of that island were as follows: of clarified sugar, 47,516,531 pounds; in 1841, after this system had been fully tested, of clarified sugar not a pound. In 1789, of muscovado sugar, 93,573,300 pounds; 1841, 1,363 pounds. Of coffee, in 1789, 76,335,219 pounds; in 1841, 34,114,417 pounds. Of cotton, in 1789, 7,400,274 pounds; in 1841, the inconsiderable quantity of 1,591,454 pounds. These statistics, sir, show the effect of that emancipation upon the island of Hayti. Following this example of France, Great Britain, in 1833, emancipated the islands of the West Indies, and amongst them the island of Jamaica and of Guiana. I have statistics to show the effect of that act upon the resources, the wealth, and the products of these places.

Mr. BLAIR. I wish to state to the House, at this point of the gentleman's speech, in reference to the island of Hayti, that the export commerce of this country to that portion of the island of Hayti occupied by the free negroes, is \$350,000 greater than the entire trade with Mexico, which has eight millions of population. The export to Hayti, not including the Dominican Republic, for 1851, as shown by the book on Commercial Relations printed by this House, was, of flour, eight times more than that of Cuba; of pork, six times more; and of dry goods, about twelve times as much. This is the value of that island which has been destroyed, as it is said, by the emancipation of slaves.

Mr. GARTRELL. Conceding the gentleman's statistics to be true, they but affirm the position I have assumed on this question. It is not how much it takes to feed those negroes there, but what they have made. That is the question; not your exports to that country, but their exports.

Mr. BLAIR. They have been able to pay for what they have got, or else they never would have received it from this country.

Mr. GARTRELL. They are supported by their fostering Governments; and I will show the gentleman that those Governments are tired of the burden. But, sir, I pass on; I desire to show by statistics the effect of this emancipation statute on the island of Jamaica and Guiana. That statute was passed in 1833. In 1833, in the island of Jamaica, they raised 1,140,760 cwt. of sugar; in 1841, fifteen years thereafter, 633,478 cwt. In 1833, 11,154,307 pounds of coffee; and in 1849, 3,399,093 lbs. In 1833, 982 cwt. of molasses; and in 1849, 102 cwt. In 1832, 2,450,272 gallons of rum; and in 1849, 1,778,661 gallons.

The effect on Guiana is more palpable. I will not consume my time in reading the statistics in regard to it. I will simply ask the reporters to incorporate them in my printed remarks. I trust gentlemen of the House will not object.

GUIANA—EXPORTS.

Year.	Sugar, cwt.	Coffee, lbs.	Molasses, cwt.	Cotton, bales.	Rum, gallons.
1836	712,500	4,501,350	350,850	3,196	2,955,120
1849	577,560	63,223	155,952	-	1,882,142

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri read from Earl Grey's letters, to show that this colonizing scheme of the blacks had succeeded in the island of Trinidad. That, sir, was an exceedingly unfortunate example for the case stated by my friend from Missouri. I have an article, which appeared in the *London Times* of a late date, which disposes very summarily, by facts and arguments, of the position assumed by that gentleman in reference to Trinidad. It overthrows altogether the predictions, the imaginings, and fancy sketches, alluded to by the gentleman, as taken from Earl Grey's correspondence. The *London Times*, the leading English journal, combats the policy of the English Government in breaking down "the slave system of the West Indies, without attempting to replace it with a better," and chronicles the fact that those "colonies are perishing for the want of labor." It says:

"Our attention has been directed to a report of the Council on immigration for the island of Trinidad, which shows how a British colony may decay, while all around is flourishing. If Trinidad had remained under Spanish sway, it might, in spite of tyranny and misrule, be the wealthy island which its position and fertility would naturally make it. But we learn that, although the island contains one million two hundred and fifty thousand acres, yet the extent of all the land now under cultivation is about fifty-two thousand eight hundred and seven acres; and of this area the sugar plantations cover only thirty-four thousand and fifty-nine acres. The entire number of agricultural laborers working for wages in the cultivation of sugar and cocoa is only fourteen thousand, of whom nearly eight thousand are immigrants from India and China, introduced at the public expense."

And then, speaking of the immigrants from India and China, and eagerly craving their enslavement, continues thus:

"It is found that these are by far better laborers for wages than the negro, who, it is stated, 'will not be stimulated to greater industry by any increase of wages.' And at the present time the planters would gladly obtain labor by an advance of wages. The high price of sugar and other tropical productions has stimulated enterprise; a greater extent of land is being brought under cultivation, and all that is wanted for the development of the colony is a supply of hands. Such are the fertility and the abundance of land, that 'the expense of establishing, on virgin land, an estate capable of producing two hundred and fifty hogsheads of sugar, including the cost of machinery and buildings, would not exceed £6,000 sterling.' But, with the present supply of labor, even the present production of the colony cannot be kept up."

These significant extracts but foreshadow the disposition of the English Government to return in this, the nineteenth century, to a system of

Slavery more oppressive than the world has ever seen.

That Government, satisfied that the experiment has failed, is beginning to throw aside these misguided notions of philanthropy. They are coming up to the spirit of the age. They have had time to see the working, the effect, the conservative influence, of domestic Slavery in this country, not only upon the South, but upon the North. And, sir, I hazard nothing in the assertion here to-day, (and I appeal to my Northern friends for the truth of it,) that slave labor and the products of slave labor have done more to build up your Lowells, to aid in the construction of your railroads, to rear your cities, and make you (as you justly are) a proud, intelligent, Christian people, than anything else. I say that the cotton-bag has effected more than all other powers together. That proposition cannot be controverted—it will not be controverted. I have statistics, and can demonstrate it clearly to any one, that the products of slave labor have done more, not only to elevate this country in point of wealth and enterprise, not only to develop its resources, North as well as South, but, sir, they have done more to evangelize and christianize the nation than all other causes combined. I see that some of our friends over the way smile at the remark. It is suggested by a friend behind me that they are displeased with the truth of it.

Mr. LOVEJOY. Will the gentleman allow me to request him to read, in connection with what he has already read from the Bible, the fifteenth and sixteenth verses of the twenty-third chapter of Deuteronomy, or allow me to read them?

Mr. GARTRELL. I will let the gentleman read them.

Mr. LOVEJOY. They are as follows:

"15. Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee.

"16. He shall dwell with thee, even among you, in that place which he shall choose, in one of thy gates where it liketh him best; thou shalt not oppress him."

I would also like the gentleman to quote the eighth commandment, in connection with the tenth.

Mr. GARTRELL. I will ask the gentleman a question, and I hope he will answer it categorically. Does the gentleman consider the African equal to the white man?

Mr. LOVEJOY. That depends altogether upon his character, sir. [Laughter.]

Mr. GARTRELL. The gentleman has read from Deuteronomy to show that thou shouldst not deliver up a slave who escapes from his master. I ask the gentleman whether he abides by that text, or whether he abides by the Constitution of his forefathers and mine, which says that the runaway slave shall be delivered up?

Mr. LOVEJOY. I understood the gentle-

man to say, in his speech, that the Bible was a "higher law," binding every one; and, in the second place, I abide by the Bible and the Constitution, for the Constitution says no such thing.

Mr. GARTRELL. The gentleman says that he abides by the Bible and the Constitution. Then, sir, he must go South, and settle upon our plantations. We claim you as a slaveholder. We claim you as an advocate of the principle and the practice; for the Bible says—God, in the Bible, himself says—"Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's manservant nor his maid servant." And further on it is expressly inculcated that slaves owe obedience to their masters, and ought to render it. And, furthermore, that they shall be our inheritance, our possession, our bondmen, forever.

But, Mr. Chairman, I desire to proceed very briefly in my line of argument. I was apprehensive that these quotations from Holy Writ might occasion a little fluttering over the way. It is well enough, however, to revert occasionally to sound principles—to go to the fountain-head.

Mr. STANTON. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. GARTRELL. Certainly.

Mr. SEWARD. I object to farming out the floor in this way.

Mr. STANTON. Does the gentleman [Mr. GARTRELL] understand his quotations from Holy Writ as applying to African slaves?

Mr. GARTRELL. I understand them to apply to all kinds of Slavery; while the Africans were, as I understand, the heathen spoken of and alluded to by the Scriptures.

Mr. STANTON. Then, as I understand the gentlemen, it is not a question of color or race, but a question of social condition.

Mr. GARTRELL. Having disposed of this branch of the question, and finding my time running short, I deem it unnecessary—

Mr. BURROUGHS. I ask the unanimous consent of the House, that the gentleman be allowed to finish his speech, and say all he has to say.

Mr. GARTRELL. I am very much obliged to the gentleman; and I should be very much obliged to the Committee, if it chose to extend to me this unusual courtesy. I will not, however, claim it. I cannot ask it at its hands.

But I desire to consider another question alluded to by the gentleman from Missouri, [Mr. BLAIR,] and it is but a repetition of the argument that seems to have been current in the Northern States for many years. It is said, Mr. Chairman, very exultingly, too, that this institution of Slavery at the South has a demoralizing effect on the social position of the people of that section. I deny it. I hold, sir, that the statistics of this country show the reverse to be true. If crime, if pauperism, if indigence, if want, if misery, be evidences of demoralization, then to-day the Southern people

occupy a proud position, as contrasted with that of its accusers. I call the attention of gentlemen to some statistics taken from the census report of 1850. Under the head of "crime," I find that in the Northern States the number of native-born persons convicted of crime was ten thousand eight hundred and twenty-three; while in the Southern States they were but nineteen hundred and seventeen. The number of foreign-born persons convicted of crime in the Northern States was twelve thousand seven hundred and eighty-nine; in the Southern States, but eight hundred and ninety-four. The total number in the North being twenty-three thousand six hundred and twelve, and in the slaveholding States but two thousand eight hundred and eleven. Then, sir, under the head of "pauperism," I find that the number of native-born paupers in the Northern States, in the same year, was fifty thousand and twenty-three; while in the Southern States it was but sixteen thousand four hundred and eleven. Of foreign-born paupers there were, in the Northern States, sixty-three thousand six hundred and eighty-nine; and in the Southern States four thousand eight hundred and forty-nine. Total number of paupers in the Northern States, one hundred and thirteen thousand seven hundred and twelve; in the Southern States, twenty-one thousand two hundred and sixty.

It is no pleasure to me to read these statistics; but I read them not only in defence, but in justification, of the system of domestic Slavery, as it exists in my section, and which I am here to-day ready and prepared to defend against all comers and goers. I say that I regret this state of things. I do not refer to them to the disparagement of the intelligence, morality, enterprise, or industry, of our Northern brethren. They are exempt from it as much as most people are. I honor them for their intelligence; I honor them as Christian people; I honor them for their enterprise; I honor them when they stand by the Constitution of our fathers. But when they seek, as some have sought on this floor, and as others seek elsewhere, to wage war on the constitutional rights of my people, I may be permitted to tell them of their own faults, and to cite the records of their own misfortunes.

But I will not stop here, sir. I will read to you an extract from a report made by a committee appointed a few years ago by the Legislature of New York, and which report throws a great deal of light on this question.

This report shows:

"It seems that a committee was sent by the Legislature of New York to look into the condition of the lower and working classes of the city. They report, April 4, 1856, that in twenty-two districts twelve hundred tenement houses are occupied by *ten* families each, in some by *seventy* families, others one hundred, and in one, in particular, *one hundred and forty-six*

families, or more than an average of one family and a half to each room! But let the committee speak:

"In the houses visited by your committee, sights were presented to them alike startling and painful to behold. *In many, whites and blacks were living indiscriminately together; negro men with white women, and white men with negro women.* Young faces, haggard with want and sickness, and bearing that peculiar look of premature old age imparted by early sin, gazed at them from every corner; misery and vice in their most repulsive features met them at every step. Scarcely an apartment was free from sickness and disease, and the blighting curse of drunkenness had fallen upon almost every family. Here and there might be found, it is true, some attempt at cleanliness, some display of a love of home, some evidences of industry and sobriety, with their natural accompaniments, cheerfulness and good health. But these, your committee found, were in most instances families that had not long been inhabitants of the neighborhoods in which they lived. The demoralization and ruin apparent all around had not had time to do their work on them. It is to be feared that too soon the miasmal air will creep into their systems, undermining the sturdy constitution, and prostrating its victims on a bed of sickness. Health failing them, want will follow; and then must come crowding rapidly upon them, neglect of home, neglect of children, uncleanness, drunkenness, and crime. This is no fancy sketch, no picture of the imagination. It is a stern reality, enacted every day in the midst of luxury and wealth, the natural and fearful result of the rapacity of landlords in an overcrowded city, unrestrained by conscience, and wholly unchecked by legislation."

I will not pursue this report further, but I simply recommend it to the attention of the gentleman and of the Committee. I did not cite it for the purpose of displaying the misery, the woe, the destitution, and the want, of the poorer classes of the North. God knows they have my sympathy and my commiseration. I would that it were in my power to relieve the poor of the North as well as the poor of the South. I have read this extract, not to bring a blush to the faces of my Northern friends; I read it in sorrow. I read it, however, with a hope that I might thereby encourage them to begin the good work at home; that I might thereby assist in relieving the poor and miserable and destitute there, by reminding our friends of that charity which begins at home. Where, in the South, Mr. Chairman, could we find misery and want and wretchedness and destitution like that reported by this able and intelligent committee of the Legislature of New York? Go to the negro plantation, if you please, and what will you find? Health, plenty to eat, good clothes, comfortable beds,

and but one family in a house. You will ransack even the pages of Uncle Tom's Cabin, and you will find no picture of misery and destitution which will compare with that portrayed in the extract which I have just read. No, sir; that book, which may be justly characterized as a *picture*, a *libel*, painted by the hand of slander, will furnish nothing to compare with it.

But, sir, I will not pursue this branch of the argument further. What I have said has been with a view to modify, and soften down, by bringing about reflection and consideration of this question, rather than to excite. I deprecate excitement. I had hoped that in this Congress at least we should have been exempt from the continual excitement upon the Slavery question. I had hoped that it would have been taken from the Halls of Congress, and left where the legislation of Congress properly leaves it—to the people of the Territory, when they come to frame their Constitution, and apply for admission into the Union. Sir, these were my expectations, and they were reasonable and just, because the legislation of the country, which received the sanction of Congress and the approbation of the people in the last Presidential election, had met this question, and taken it from the Halls of Congress, and put it into the hands of the people of the Territories, when they were prepared to lay aside their Territorial condition, and assume that of a State sovereignty. But, hardly had we met within the walls of this Capitol, and Congress organized, before the battle cry was raised, and,

"Once more unto the breach, dear friends, once more!"

was heard through the ranks of the Black Republican party. Why these continual aggressions? Why deny to us, to-day, our rights under the Constitution of our country? I beg to ask, what have the Southern people done to warrant it? When have they ever waged war upon your rights? When have they ever proved recreant to the Constitution of your fathers and ours? When have they ever refused to expend their blood and treasure for the maintenance of the common honor and integrity of the nation? When have they ever failed to stand by their Northern brethren in their hour of trial? Sir, the South has always been true and loyal to the Constitution. She is loyal to it now; she is ready to preserve it for your children and their children—that they, arm in arm, and hand in hand, may perpetuate it to our latest posterity. But, in order to do this, I tell gentlemen plainly, I tell them dispassionately, I tell them coolly and deliberately, that your assaults must cease. Sir, I think I know something of Southern loyalty, as well as Southern impatience under your encroachments, and I tell gentlemen that the time has come when this question has to be met fairly by your action in this House. Upon the action of this Congress must depend the union or disunion of this great Confederacy.

Gentlemen need not tell me that I am an extremist or an alarmist; that the South has threatened disunion before, and, when the hour came, she backed out. Sir, I tell you this is no idle threat. Indeed, it is not made as a threat, but as a warning. It is my duty to speak thus plainly here, and to announce the deep seated, unwavering, unalterable determination of the masses of our people at the South, of all parties, to have equality in this Union, or independence out of it. It is best that individuals, as well as States, should be plain and candid with each other. I do not speak thus to-day to alarm gentlemen. I am not here to suppose that anything I may say would alarm our friends on the other side of the House. If I speak feelingly, it is because I feel deeply on this question of preserving intact the Constitution of the country; of preserving our glorious flag, the sovereignty of the States, and the rights and honor of the South. The Union cannot be preserved, unless our rights are protected. I should be recreant to my duty, if I did not proclaim this determination no longer to submit to insult and outrage. I have the honor of representing fifteen thousand freemen upon this floor; and I hazard nothing in saying that every man of them will respond "amen" to the sentiments I express here to-day. I hazard nothing when I assert that there will not be found in that constituency one man who is not ready and determined to proclaim, as I proclaim to-day, that if you will preserve the Union of these States, you must give us the full measure of our constitutional rights. We ask nothing more—we will take nothing less. Is there anything unreasonable in this? But, sir, this brings me to to the Kansas question, and I understand that I have but five minutes left, in which to discuss it.

Mr. BURROUGHS. I renew the request that, by unanimous consent, the gentleman be allowed to go on until he has finished his speech.

Mr. FLORENCE. I object. The gentleman will understand the reason for my objection.

Mr. GARTRELL. I desire to say, for my time has been very brief, that what I have said has been directed mainly to the attainment of

two objects. These objects are paramount with me to-day. Proud as an American citizen, proud of the country, and the whole country, of the North as well as the South, my object is to demand forbearance at your hands, and preserve, if we can, the Union of our fathers. My second object is to have secured to the people of the South their constitutional rights, fully, entirely, and effectually. You may drive me from my first position; you may force me to abandon the Union; you may tear the stars and stripes, under which our fathers fought and won our liberties, and trample it under foot; you may drive me from my advocacy of the Union; but, sir, never, while I have an arm to raise or a tongue to speak, a heart to feel or a hand to strike, can you drive me from the maintenance of Southern rights and Southern equality.

I tell gentlemen, further, that in order to preserve that Union, you must admit Kansas as a State into this Union with the Lecompton Constitution. You must admit her as a slave State, with that Constitution. And why? Sir, this whole Kansas question is "in a nut-shell." It depends upon a single principle—it is the doctrine, the principle of non-intervention, sustained by the great Democratic party of the country in the last Presidential election. Democrats from New York, Pennsylvania, and other Northern States, have gallantly and manfully stood by this principle. I honor them for it. The South honors them for it. They are *National Democrats*; and, as *such*, are dear to the people of my section. We honor them for their devotion to principle. But, sir, I said this Kansas question depends upon the great principle of non-intervention. Has that principle been observed? I say it has not. We have had intervention there. It has been the intervention of Walker and Stanton against the South, and in favor of the North; and it does not lie in the mouths of gentlemen to make objection to her admission now. It is true the South has achieved a triumph in Kansas; but it was a victory won over intervention on the part of the officers of the General Government against Slavery and against the South.

[Here the hammer fell.]